Exhibit 8

1	WILLIAM L. ANTHONY (State Bar No. 1009	
2	ERIC L. WESENBERG (State Bar No. 139696	)
2	HEIDI L. KEEFF (State Bar No. 178960)	_
3	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LL 1000 Marsh Road	P
4	Menlo Park, CA 94025	
•	Telephone: 650-614-7400	
5	Facsimile: 650-614-7401	· ·
6	STEVEN ALEXANDER (admitted <i>Pro Hac V</i>	ice)
7	KRISTIN L. CLEVELAND (admitted Pro Hac	·
•	JAMES E. GERINGER (admitted Pro Hac Vic	e)
8	JOHN D. VANDENBERG	
_	KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP	
9	One World Trade Center, Suite 1600	
10	121 S.W. Salmon Street	
	Portland, OR 97204	
11	Telephone: 503-226-7391 Facsimile: 503-228-9446	
12	r acsimile. 303-226-3440	
13	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant, MICROSOFT CORPORATION	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
14	ONITED STATES DISTRICT COOKT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	OAKLAND DIVISION	
17	INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	CASE NO. C01-1640 SBA
18	· ·	
••	Plaintiff,	MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S
19	v.	PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-2
20	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a	DISCLOSURE OF PRELIMINARY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND
	Washington corporation,	EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE (LIMITED
21	Defendant.	TO "MINI-MARKMAN" CLAIMS)
22	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a	
22	Washington corporation,	
23		·
	Counterclaimant,	
24	v.	·
25	INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES	
26	CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	
26	Counter Claim-Defendant.	
27		
28		

MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-2 DISCLOSURE (LIMITED TO "MINI-MARKMAN" CLAIMS), CASE NO. C 01-1640 SBA Pursuant to Patent Local Rule 4-2 and this Court's Order, entered November 5, 2002,
Defendant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") hereby serves its "Disclosure Of Preliminary
Claim Construction And Extrinsic Evidence," limited to the twelve selected "Mini-Markman"
patent claims. Microsoft's preliminary claim construction is based upon the proposed terms,
phrases and clauses, and claims as a whole, identified by the parties in their submissions in
accordance with Patent Local Rule 4-1(a) and conference in accordance with Patent Local Rule 41(b).

Microsoft provides its preliminary claim construction of each of the 12 "Mini-Markman" claims subject to the limitations and reservations of rights set forth herein. Microsoft does not waive any defenses that the asserted claims fail to satisfy the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112 including, for example, the written description requirement, the definiteness requirement, or any other requirement for patentability. Microsoft does not concede that the asserted claims are supported by Plaintiff's original application or any application from which they purportedly claim priority. Specifically, by offering a construction of a term, Microsoft does not waive any defense that the claim is in fact indefinite and there can be no proper construction.

Microsoft provides its preliminary claim construction in the following format. Exhibit A sets forth Microsoft's preliminary construction of (1) the claim term "virtual distribution environment" ("VDE"), (2) the "VDE invention" disclosed in the February, 1995, InterTrust patent application, and (3) certain other claim terms. Exhibit B sets forth Microsoft's preliminary construction of the disputed claims as a whole, and particular claim phrases in dispute, in the order of appearance in a claim. Where an individual claim term (within a phrase) is also in dispute, it will be bold-faced in Exhibits A and B. Exhibit C sets forth Microsoft's preliminary construction of the individual terms in dispute, in alphabetical order.

Microsoft reserves the right to modify its preliminary claim constructions in the event that the parties are unable to agree upon a particular claim construction. Furthermore, because InterTrust has not yet fully complied with the disclosure requirements of Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2, Microsoft expressly reserves the right to amend its preliminary claim construction if

evidence becomes available through those disclosures (or that should have been provided therein) that would support amended constructions. Microsoft further reserves the right to amend its preliminary claim constructions once it has an opportunity to review InterTrust's preliminary claim constructions and once the parties have further met and conferred as required.

## Preliminary Identification of Evidence in Support of Claim Construction

Microsoft's preliminary claim construction is supported by the intrinsic record of the seven U.S. patents from which the 12 "Mini-Markman" claims are selected. For the purposes of submission of this preliminary claim construction only, Microsoft treats the "intrinsic" evidence as including: 1) the specifications of each of the seven U.S. patents at issue in the "Mini-Markman" proceeding, including any material purportedly incorporated by reference therein; 2) the prosecution history of each of the seven patents at issue, including the applications and prosecution history of the seven patents and any related patent applications, including without limitation, applications purportedly incorporated by reference or to which an application claimed priority; and 3) all references cited in the prosecution of any such applications. In accordance with the local rules, this evidence is not specifically identified, except to the extent that Microsoft asserts particular sections of a patents' specifications provide "structure" for claims properly construed under 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).

In certain circumstances, Microsoft's preliminary construction may be supported by extrinsic evidence presently available to Microsoft. Microsoft reserves the right to modify or supplement with evidence that it has not yet been able to fully review, due to InterTrust's production, including without limitation, InterTrust re-production of over 1,000,000 pages on November 4, 2002. Microsoft reserves the right to supplement with additional evidence gathered in the course of the discovery collected between now and the close of "claim construction" discovery or later submitted by InterTrust in full compliance with its disclosure obligations under Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2. Extrinsic evidence is identified or produced in accordance with the local rule and set forth in the following exhibits:

1	Exhibit D: Contains copies of excerpts from dictionaries and other publications. Due to
2	the volume of the appended pages, Exhibit D will be served via Federal Express.
3	Exhibit E: Contains a list of selected production documents, identified by initial bates
4	number.
5	Exhibit F: Contains a list of selected, uncited prior art publications, identified by bates
6	number(s).
7	Exhbit G: Contains a list of selected, uncited prior art patents, identified by bates
8	number(s).
9	In addition to the extrinsic evidence cited in Exhibits D-G, Microsoft incorporates by
0	reference herein and reserves the right to rely upon: 1) all documents identified by InterTrust in
1	response to discovery or pursuant to the Patent Local Rules; 2) all InterTrust patents,
2 '	publications and other things that are prior art to any Mini-Markman claim; and 3) the testimony
13	of InterTrust and the witnesses identified below.
4	
	n i vi vi co co comi
15	Preliminary Identification of Witnesses <sup>1</sup>
15 16	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:
	$\cdot$
16	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:
16 17	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are
16 17 18	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from
16 17 18 19 20	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a
16 17 18	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper
16 17 18 19 20	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper context and determine their precise, correct meaning as used in the patents. These terms include
16 17 18 19 20 21	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper context and determine their precise, correct meaning as used in the patents. These terms include "secure container," "control," "govern," "protect," "protected processing environment," "secure,"
16 17 18 19 20 21	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper context and determine their precise, correct meaning as used in the patents. These terms include "secure container," "control," "govern," "protect," "protected processing environment," "secure," "securely," "security," "virtual distribution environment";
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper context and determine their precise, correct meaning as used in the patents. These terms include "secure container," "control," "govern," "protect," "protected processing environment," "secure," "securely," "security," "virtual distribution environment";  2) that the concepts stated in the InterTrust patents were known to the art, including the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor John Mitchell: Dr. Mitchell will testify of the following matters:  1) that certain of the presently disputed terms and phrases used in the twelve claims are amorphous terms lacking a well-defined, precise meaning that can accurately be gleaned from technical or other dictionaries. Rather, these terms are used in the art and/or in the patents in a manner that requires close consideration of the entire patent specification to put them in proper context and determine their precise, correct meaning as used in the patents. These terms include "secure container," "control," "govern," "protect," "protected processing environment," "secure," "securely," "security," "virtual distribution environment";  2) that the concepts stated in the InterTrust patents were known to the art, including the cited prior art, which cited art he will describe;

RULE 4-2 DISCLOSURE (LIMITED TO "MINI-MARKMAN" CLAIMS), CASE NO. C 01-1640 SBA

## 1 DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY E-MAIL 2 I am more than eighteen years old and not a party to this action. My place of employment 3 and business address is 121 S.W. Salmon St., Suite 1600, Portland, OR 97204. 4 On December 20, 2002, at 3:00 p.m., I served on counsel for InterTrust Technologies 5 Corporation: MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-2 6 DISCLOSURE OF PRELIMINARY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND 7 EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE (LIMITED TO "MINI-MARKMAN" CLAIMS) 8 by email delivery to: 9 Michael H. Page, Esq. **Douglas Derwin** 10 John W. Keker, Esq. InterTrust Technologies Corporation Jon B. Streeter, Esq. 4800 Patrick Henry Drive 11 Keker & Van Nest, LLP Santa Clara, CA 95054 710 Sansome Street Telephone: 408-855-0100 12 San Francisco, CA 94111 Facsimile: 408-855-0144 Telephone: 415-391-5400 13 Email: dderwin@intertrust.com Facsimile: 415-397-7188 Email: mhp@kvn.com 14 15 Steven H. Morrissett, Esq. Finnegan Henderson Farabow 16 Garrett & Dunner Stanford Research Park 17 700 Hansen Way 18 Palo Alto CA 94304-1016 Telephone: 202-408-4000 19 Facsimile: 202-408-4400 Email: steven.morrissett@finnegan.com 20 21 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 22 Executed on December 20, 2002, at Portland, Oregon. 23 24 25

MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-2 DISCLOSURE (LIMITED TO "MINI-MARKMAN" CLAIMS), CASE NO. C 01-1640 SBA

26

27

28